

ID. Date of interview  
date 17/01/20

ID. Time interview started  
start 16:57:20

ID.end Completion date of interview  
Date 17/01/20

ID.end Time interview ended  
17:04:25

ID. Duration of interview  
time 7.08

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

☒ Yes

☐ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Some topics could do with some further clarification. For example, when a request is manifestly unfounded, we need more support in that area, supported by examples.

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

☐ Yes

☒ No

☐ Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

More examples re previous question, with ID, and maybe some relevant to different industries.

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

An individual is banned from shopping in any of our stores, and knows this. They go into our stores and frequently request CCTV images of themselves in our store. They do not purchase anything and go in purely to create data for us to supply to them. We provide the data via a secure link, which we get notification of once opened. The individual never opens the respond containing images. They have even stated they do this for the purpose of wasting time on the odd occasion.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 – Slightly useful	3 – Moderately useful	4 – Very useful	5 – Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

elaborates on topics much more than previous guidance, however some topics not in enough detail.

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

Q9 Are you answering as:

- ☐ An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- ☒ An individual acting in a professional capacity
- ☐ On behalf of an organisation
- ☐ Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

Lidl

What sector are you from:

retail

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ☐ ICO Twitter account
- ☐ ICO Facebook account
- ☐ ICO LinkedIn account
- ☐ ICO website
- ☐ ICO newsletter
- ☐ ICO staff member
- ☐ Colleague
- ☐ Personal/work Twitter account
- ☐ Personal/work Facebook account
- ☐ Personal/work LinkedIn account
- ☒ Other

If other please specify:

BRC